

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
CHARLOTTE DIVISION
3:22-cr-72-FDW-DCK-1

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)
)
 Plaintiff,)
 vs.) **ORDER**
)
 NGOMANI DEKATTU,)
)
 Defendant.)
)

THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Defendant's *pro se* Letters that are construed as Motions [Doc. 2].

On March 2, 2022, the instant case was opened when jurisdiction over Petitioner's supervised release, imposed by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, was transferred to this Court. [Doc. 1]. Petitioner was arrested on April 7, 2022 on a Petition for Warrant for Offender Under Supervision. [Docs. 2, 4]. Petitioner was appointed counsel¹ and, on April 14, 2022, a United States Magistrate Judge entered an Order of Detention. [Doc. 8]. The Court anticipates scheduling the final revocation hearing during its next criminal term. See [Doc. 24].

Petitioner has filed two *pro se* Letters [Docs. 17, 24] that are construed as Motions, in which he argues that the supervised release violation report should be dismissed, and asks to be released from the Mecklenburg County Jail pending his final revocation hearing.

The Motions are not properly before the Court because the Defendant, who is represented by counsel, has no right to hybrid representation. See McKaskle v. Wiggins, 465 U.S. 168, 183

¹ Counsel moved to withdraw on April 20, 2022, and the Motion was granted following a hearing; Petitioner's present attorney, David Ross Lange, entered his Notice of Appearance on April 29, 2022. [Docs. 10, 13].

(1984) (noting that there is no constitutional right to “hybrid representation” in which a defendant is represented by both himself and counsel). Counsel has not adopted the pending *pro se* Motions and, accordingly, they will be stricken as unauthorized *pro se* filings.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the Defendant’s *pro se* Letters [Docs. 17, 24] are construed as Motions and are **STRICKEN**.

Signed: August 8, 2022



Frank D. Whitney
United States District Judge